

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-2, 4-12, and 14-20 are currently pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Reconsideration of claims 1-2, 4-12, and 14-20 in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, 4-12, and 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,782,339 to Nesser et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,718,515 to Conner et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,943,683 to Yamaguchi et al., and U.S. Patent No. 5,970,488 to Crowe et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 generally relates to a computer-implemented method of providing a gauge table for a railcar tank and an error report. Among other limitations, amended claim 1 requires the steps of “comparing said header information and said detail information file with the received request” and “generating an error report based on the comparison of said header information and said detail information file with the received request.” As described in the specification, the data in the detail information file and header information file is compared with the inputted request to determine if the data contained in detail information and header information is in the proper content and in the proper form to satisfy the request. (*See Specification, Pg. 9, lns. 1-25*). The Examiner contends that Yamaguchi discloses analyzing the data in the record management table in an error process and sending an error report to a source request where said sending inherently shows that an error report is generated before sending. (*See Office Action dated January 20, 2006, Pg. 5*). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Yamaguchi is directed to a record management table, and in particular to the operation of a record operation instruction that is inputted in to a processing unit 12 in the system. (Yamaguchi, Col. 7, lns. 19-23). With respect to the Examiner’s contention, it appears the Examiner contends that the received request of claim 1 is analogous to the inputted record operation instruction of Yamaguchi and the detail information file and header information of claim 1 is analogous to the record management table of Yamaguchi. Applicants respectfully

disagree that there is correspondence between these elements, but address the Examiner's contentions below.

In Yamaguchi, the processing unit 12 analyzes the request (record operation instruction) to determine if the request is a retrieval instruction, an update instruction, a deletion instruction, or a storage instruction. The processing unit 12 creates an error report only when the request is not one of these pre-determined types of instructions. (Yamaguchi, Col. 7, Ins. 39-50). The detail information file and header information (record management table) is not compared to the request to confirm that the detail information file and header information (record management table) is in the proper form and proper content to satisfy the request. Indeed, nothing in the detail information file (record management table) is analyzed to generate the error report. Rather, only the request (record operation instruction) is analyzed to determine whether it is one of a pre-determined type. As a result, Yamaguchi fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "comparing said header information and said detail information file with the received request" and "generating an error report based on the comparison of said header information and said detail information file with the received request." Applicants also further submit that neither Nesser, Conner, nor Crowe disclose, teach, or suggest the above-recited limitation.

In order to establish a prima facie case under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the prior art reference, or combination of references must teach or suggest all the limitations of the claims. *In re Zurko*, 111 F.3d 887, 888-89, 42 U.S.P.Q.2d 1476, 1478 (Fed. Cir. 1997). As noted above, the combination of the references fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all the limitations of claim 1. As a result, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references. Additionally, claims 2 and 4-10 depend on claim 1 and include all the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, Applicant's respectfully submit that claims 2 and 4-10 are also patentable over the cited references.

Similar to claim 1, amended claim 11 is directed to a system for providing a gauge table for a railcar tank and an error report. Among other limitations, claim 11 requires "means for comparing said header information and said detail information file with the received request" and "means for generating an error report based on the comparison of said header information and said detail information file with the received request and using said error report to determine

whether either of said header information and said detail information contains one or more errors to be corrected before converting and providing said gauge table.”

For the reasons stated with respect to claim 1, Applicants submit that Yamaguchi, Nesser, Conner, and Crowe, individually, or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest “comparing said header information and said detail information file with the received request” and “generating an error report based on the comparison of said header information and said detail information file with the received request.” Therefore, the combination of the references fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all the limitations of claim 11 and Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11 is patentable over the cited references. Additionally, claims 12 and 14-20 depend on claim 11 and include all the limitations of claim 11. Therefore, Applicant’s respectfully submit that claims 12 and 14-20 are also patentable over the cited references.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims in the Application are in allowable form and that the Application is in condition for allowance. If, however, any outstanding issues remain, Applicants respectfully urge the Examiner to telephone Applicants’ undersigned attorney so that the same may be resolved and the Application expedited to issue. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to indicate all claims as allowable and to pass the Application to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Patrick D. Richards

Patrick D. Richards  
Registration No. 48,905

227 West Monroe Street  
Chicago, IL 60606-5096  
Phone: 312.372.2000  
Facsimile: 312.984.7700  
**Date: May 11, 2006**

**Please recognize our Customer No. 1923  
as our correspondence address.**